Peace Brevities.

. . . Judge Alton B. Parker, former Democratic candidate for the Presidency, heartily supports the arbitration treaties. In a telegram to the mass-meeting in San Francisco, he said: "The general arbitration treaties will tend to assure peace between the contracting powers, and so prove, as we may well believe, the first great steps in a universal movement for peace. And, therefore, after an amendment requiring confirmation of the commissioners by the Senate, which the President is willing to concede, the treaties should, after careful deliberation, be ratified by the Senate of the United States. Peace, rather than war, is the normal condition of civilized human beings, and a steady progress toward sound and enduring conditions of peace can be achieved only from the regulated administration of justice, international as well as national."

. . . In a recent statement urging ratification of the treaties Mr. Carnegie said: "These warlike proceedings in Europe are a flash from the past, a passing recurrence of the practices of savage times. I do not believe they are a prelude to general warfare. The work is not moving backward. Everywhere I hear the most encouraging news about the attitude of the people toward the arbitration treaties, and I am confident the treaties will receive the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate."

. . . Thirty-five members of the faculty of Johns Hopkins University, including President Remsen, have signed resolutions favoring the ratification of the arbitration treaties with Great Britain and France, and sent them to Senator Isidor Rayner. The resolutions characterize the proposed treaties as one of the most important steps ever taken in the development of international relations.

. . . Rev. Henry Loomis, agent of the American Bible Society in Japan, writes that the report in the American papers that the Japanese government has decided upon a large increase of the navy is not true. The proposal of the navy department is not approved by the Finance Minister nor by the business men of the country. Barely enough will be appropriated by the Diet to maintain the present naval strength. "Any fear of Japan," he writes, "is utterly absurd." We echo his hope that false newspaper reports from Japan may not be allowed to stampede Congress this winter into making extraordinary appropriations for the increase of our navy.

The Arbitration Treaties with Great Britain and France.

Addresses Delivered at the Public Mass Meeting held in the Hall of the Americas, Pan-American Building, Washington, D. C., Friday, December 8, 1911, at 8 o'clock P. M.

The meeting was called to order at 8 o'clock, Senator Theodore E. Burton, president of the American Peace Society, presiding.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER.

Ladies and gentlemen: This is one of a series of meetings called on behalf of the arbitration treaties. It seemed especially appropriate that we should hold one of these gatherings in the national capital. I count it the proper function of the presiding officer to introduce the speakers rather than to make any extended remarks, and consequently shall confine myself to a very brief statement of elementary facts. The year 1815, the close of the Napoleonic wars, marked practically the beginning of a new epoch. At that time the nations, softened by calamity and exhausted by long years of almost constant warfare, began to realize that a régime of peace was much more advantageous. Prior to that time the predominant condition was one of war; since then the predominant condition has been one of peace, though there have been occasional interruptions, and we now witness the almost intolerable burden of preparedness for war or of an armed peace. The period of less than a hundred years since 1815 has been more notable in the progress of science and in those things which conduce to the uplifting of the human race than all the centuries preceding, and largely because of the absence of warfare. During this time there has been frequent resort to the settlement of disputes by arbitration. The nineteenth century witnessed nearly 500 arbitrations, some of them for the settlement of the most irritating questions—disputes about boundaries, indignities to citizens, property rights—all the provoking causes of war. Some of these arbitration treaties, and the majority of them, in fact, were for the settlement of specific controversies; a lesser number sought to lay down general principles for the settlement of all disputes. The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 greatly facilitated this disposition for peaceful settlement of controversies by the providing of a tribunal. We speak of the nineteenth century as the greatest of all the centuries, but we can almost compare with it in progress, both political and material, the first eleven years of the twentieth century. With the very beginning of this century a new impetus for the peaceful settlements of disputes commenced. In the years 1903-1904 arbitration treaties were concluded between France and Great Britain, and by the nations in the westerly portion of Europe. These treaties, which were identical in form, excepted honor and vital interest. Along contemporaneously with them it is a notable fact that in 1902 there was a treaty between Chile and the Argentine Republic, and one in 1906 between the Netherlands and Denmark, under the terms of which every ground of offense was to be left to the peaceful settlement of arbitration, thereby establishing a lasting condition of peace between those countries. In the year 1908 President Roosevelt and Secretary Root framed treaties with Great Britain and France. These treaties contained the exception of vital interest, independence, honor, and questions in which the interests of third parties are involved. They nevertheless marked a very decided progressive step.

The treaties now pending, framed by President Taft and Secretary Knox, introduce a new principle. Questions which are justiciable according to the principles of law or equity are to be settled by arbitration. This is the substantial ground for the settlement of all disputes between nations, introducing in international law the same rules which pertain between individuals in the domestic policy of nations. Wherever there is a treaty containing the exceptions of honor or vital interest, there is no possibility of accurate definition of the sub-

jects in controversy. It leaves a twilight zone—yes, darker than the twilight zone—an opportunity for those of the one nation or the other to say, "This question at issue between us involves honor or vital interest, and hence we will not submit it to arbitration." I appeal to all of you to aid in the ratification of these treaties (applause), especially to those of my own country. (Continued applause.)

It is fit that we here, enjoying our magnificent isolation, and with the trend toward peace and industry, should take the lead in this movement for arbitration which shall be world-wide. We have taken the lead in the past. Among the 500 arbitrations and more in which quarrels between nations have been averted, we have taken the foremost part, either as judges or as participants. A nation, like an individual, has a duty to perform, and it is for us to take no backward step in this great movement. (Applause.)

I take pleasure in introducing as the first speaker a member of Congress who has been an able and efficient worker in the cause of peace, who is now a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and was once its chairman. I introduce Hon. David J. Foster, a member of Congress from the Green Mountain State. (Applause.)

The Four Corner-Stones of the Temple of International Justice.

Address of Hon. David J. Foster at the Public Mass Meeting held in the Hall of the Americas, Washington, D. C., Friday Evening, December 8.

Mr. Chairman: President Taft's peace treaties are part and parcel of the world movement which above all other movements is destined to give character and distinction to the twentieth century. It is a movement for the improvement of international manners and morals and conduct. It is a movement in behalf of the development of international law, the creation of a system of international jurisprudence, analogous to that which obtains in the modern nation and in keeping with twentieth century civilization. It contemplates a very general substitution of law for force in the settlement of international differences, just as with the progress of the centuries law has supplanted force in the settlement of private differences.

The final purpose of the movement is the establishment at The Hague of a permanent international court whose doors shall be always open, whose judges shall be men learned in the law, versed in international affairs and distinguished for wisdom and probity, whose judgment will carry conviction; and then a world treaty, binding the nations to send to that court for adjudication all their international differences which cannot be adjusted by the usual methods of diplomacy. In short, the twentieth century has undertaken the task of building an international temple of justice where international differences shall be adjudicated in accordance with the principles of law and justice.

For more than a century the nations of the world have been engaged in laying the foundations broad and deep for this noble edifice. The contributions to the work have been many and varied, but there are four of them which stand out conspicuously.

In 1795 Great Britain and the United States, through the now far-famed Jay treaty, laid the first corner-stone of this noble temple of international justice; for in that treaty provision was made for the settlement by arbitration of certain boundary disputes and other vexatious differences between our country and Great Britain. That treaty was severely criticised here as a surrender to Great Britain. It was the political death knell of its author, John Jay, our first Chief Justice. About every indignity that the ingenuity of a rancorous and embittered partisan spirit could devise was heaped upon his devoted head. He was burned in effigy. He was represented as selling out his country. A staid citizen of Massachusetts records seeing upon the fence surrounding the premises of Robert Treat Paine, in huge chalk letters, these words: "Damn John Jay. Damn every one who won't damn John Jay. Damn every one who won't put candles in his window and sit up all night damning John Jay." Whether the sarcasm was conscious or unconscious, the incident plainly indicates the temper of the times. Yet that treaty marked an epoch in human history. No one studying it in the light of today has need to go further to know that John Jay was a great jurist, a great statesman, a great patriot. And thus was ushered in the modern era of international arbitration. Before that time nations went to war to settle their differences, not necessarily because they desired to do so, but because that was the only known method of settling them. Arbitration had been known in the ancient and medieval world as a method of settling international differences. It attained its greatest perfection among the Greeks. Thucydides tells us of a Spartan king who declared that it was unlawful to declare war against an opposing state until the latter had refused to submit the difference to arbitration. But long before the promulgation of the Jay treaty it had become an utterly lost art in international relations. How ready the world was for this new method is attested by the fact that according to the latest edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica one hundred and seventy-two international controversies were settled by arbitration before the close of the nineteenth century. If we include the cases settled by mixed commissions and other similar methods, we find that more than double that number of controversies were thus settled within the century. At its close arbitration had become the usual method for the settlement of international disputes among the enlightened nations.

Half a century after the Jay treaty the United States and Mexico laid the second corner-stone of this great temple of international justice. In all the instances just referred to, arbitration was agreed upon after the differences had come into existence. But in the treaty at the close of the Mexican war, in 1848, the United States and Mexico bound themselves to use their best endeavors to settle by arbitration any differences that might thereafter arise between them. This was the first instance, at least in modern times, where two nations bound themselves by treaty obligations to use their best endeavors to settle in this manner such future differences as might arise between them. That this action met with the approval of the world is strongly attested by the fact that a similar provision was incorporated in fifty-six international treaties before the close of the century whereby fifty-six pairs of nations bound themselves in a similar manner.